

REMARKS

The final rejection has been withdrawn and a new office action has been applied. Claims 1 to 4, 8, 9, 11 to 15 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Ueda et al. (US 5,690,435). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Graushar et al. (US 6,267,366). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Isaac et al. (US 5,483,893). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Rothman (US 2004/0111597). Claims 16 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Kikinis (US 6,137,591). Claims 16 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Pepperl + Fuchs.

Claims 1, 8 and 13 have been amended. Claim 20 has been added. No new claims fees are due.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

Claims 1 to 4, 8, 9, 11 to 15 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Ueda et al. (US 5,690,435).

Ueda discloses using two different categories of ribbons: single use ribbons and multiple use ribbons. See col. 5, lines 7, to 18. A detector 40 can detect whether a single use ribbon is being used or a multiple use ribbon is being used as a function of the absence or presence of a reflecting plate 41. See col. 5, lines 1 to 3.

While different kinds of ribbons are not different “types” of devices as per the present invention in that they perform the same function, for clarity claim 1 has been amended to recite:

“A method for detecting a type of one of a plurality of devices attached to a graphics machine, each device being one of at least a first type, a second type, and a third type, the method comprising:

detecting at a controller whether the device attached to or to be attached to the machine is of the first type, the second type or the third type, the controller being capable of preadjusting the device as a function of the detection.”

The present invention permits several different functioning devices to be interchanged

and the machine to be preadjusted as a result. For example a four plug connector of the present invention can permit eight different types of devices to be identified (See Specification at [0030]).

The detector of Ueda can only identify one of two categories of ribbons by the presence and absence of a reflecting plate and clearly does not teach or show “detecting at a controller whether the device attached to or to be attached to the machine is of the first type, the second type or the third type” as recited in claim 1.

Claim 8 has been amended to recite a graphics machine comprising:

a controller;

a first device connected to the controller, the first device being categorizable as one of at least a first type, a second type, and a third type, the controller detecting whether the first device is of the first type, the second type or the third type; and

a memory accessible by the controller, the memory storing information regarding the first type and the second type and the third type;

wherein the controller automatically adjusts the first device as a function of the information.

As stated above, Ueda has a binary detection system which is not capable of detecting three types of devices, and thus does not have a “controller detecting whether the first device is of the first type, the second type or the third type” as recited in claim 8.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection is respectfully requested.

It is also noted that it would not have been obvious to modify Ueda to provide more than two categories for detection as the presence or absence of the reflecting plate permits only two states for detection, and also there is no need to identify whether the cassette includes a single use or a multiple use ribbon.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Graushar et al. (US 6,267,366). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Isaac et al. (US 5,483,893). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Rothman (US 2004/0111597). Claims 16 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable

over Ueda et al. in view of Kikinis (US 6,137,591). Claims 16 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al. in view of Pepperl + Fuchs.

In view of the above arguments with respect to claims 1 and 8, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In addition, claim 5 recites that the devices are feeders for a binding line. It is respectfully submitted that one of skill in the art would not have found it obvious to have modified Ueda with the teachings of Graushar, as Ueda is a typewriter and the Graushar device is in a different field. It is respectfully submitted that one of skill in the art would not have modified a typewriter to become a binding line.

New claim 20

New claim 20 specifically recites the method for operating a binding line disclosed as the specific embodiment in the specification for example at [0025] and [0026] and in Fig. 1, and is respectfully submitted as patentable.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 
William C. Gehris, Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940